

**From:** Lubo Diakov  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/25/02 2:14am  
**Subject:** 'Microsoft Settlement'

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this as a computer user who wishes to urge you to pursue any and all remedies permitted under the law to force Microsoft to do what is right. Their actions in the past have demonstrated to me (as undoubtedly they have to others as well) that they have little or no regard for ethics. Considering the restrictive and exclusionary contracts with both computer manufacturers and end-users which have come to light during the legal proceedings, the giving away of products at a loss to drive competitors into bankruptcy, the bullying, the pressure tactics, the incessant PR spin and advertisements which often amount to lies, I feel the most just remedy is to break Microsoft up. But I am a realist, and know that sadly this won't happen for practical and legal reasons.

Instead I propose you punish them with very stiff monetary fines, which can only be repaid with money that is given "no strings attached" to purchase any computer equipment (including if the plaintiffs wish all-non-Microsoft equipment) with no legal clauses or hidden conditions. Further I suggest you reject any offer to "give" "free" equipment, as undoubtedly you will receive Microsoft products, which is not only not a punishment, it is a "get out of jail free" card for Microsoft to expand its monopoly powers to arenas which they have less or no foothold in currently, such as education.

Please note that even as you sue them about practices in the computer industry, they continue to use the same (or worse) tactics to expand even further in to non-PC areas like PDAs (PocketPC), game consoles (XBox), Internet Access (MSN Broadband). Their non-PC rivals (Palm, Sony, AOL-Time Warner) will undoubtedly tell (probably years from now) a tale similar to that of their computer competitors - one of arm twisting and being driven out of business by the sheer ruthlessness and remorselessness of a corporation so convinced (myopically) that the world needs nothing but its products, that it does anything it can (often just this side of legal, and in many case because a lot of laws don't cover the "information age") to prevail. The business equivalent of the Taliban - "fundamentalist monopolists".

You undoubtedly know plenty about Microsoft's violations of anti-trust law, but allow me to summarize by listing some of the entities it victimized, in most cases despite those entities having superior products to market before Microsoft.

Sun Computers - Java

Apple Computer - Macintosh  
Real Networks - Real Audio and Video  
Apple Computer - Quicktime  
Linux - various distributors and VARs, and the open-source community  
worldwide

All these had products that dominated either because they were first in their fields, or because were actually good (or both). Microsoft dominates because it has the most money, and it can give things away until everyone else folds and then charge as much as they want. Is this what America (and the world) wants? I think not.

Finally I leave you with this tidbit, attributed to no other than Bill Gates himself:

-----  
"Imagine the disincentive to software development if after months of work another company could come along and copy your work and market it under its own name...without legal restraints to such copying, companies like Apple could not afford to advance the state of the art." -- Bill Gates, 1983  
(New York Times, 25 Sep 1983, p. F2)  
-----